

S/N 10/573,318
In response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2009

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended and is supported in the specification at, for example, page 10, lines 7-14, page 11, lines 5-9, and FIGs. 1 and 2A. Claim 4 has been amended editorially to correspond to claim 1. Claims 5-7 have been added and are supported in the specification at, for example, page 11, lines 16-23 and FIGs. 1 and 2A. No new matter is added.

Specification Objection

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The terminology "wider width portion" and "narrower width portion", as used in the claims, clearly denotes the widths as discussed in the specification at page 11, lines 5-9. There is no requirement that the terminology used in the specification and the claims exactly correspond so long as the meaning of the terms is apparent (MPEP 608.01(o)). It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (JP 2003-146337), Tomiyoshi et al. (JP 11-208676) and Gomi (JP 2001-48193). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an elongated packaging material for manufacturing a plurality of pouches comprising a series of unit pouch areas connected serially to each other along a length of the packaging material. Side sealing portions are provided at side ends of a first elongated flexible sheet and a second elongated flexible sheet layered on the first sheet. The side sealing portions extend lengthwise of the first and second sheets and have a plurality of projecting portions that project toward a center of width of the sheets, between an adjacent pair of cross sealing portions. Each of the first and second elongated flexible sheets includes a first and second wider width portion between each said projecting portion and a first and second of the adjacent cross sealing portions and a

S/N 10/573,318
In response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2009

narrower width portion at each said projecting portion. Each of the first wider width portion and the second wider portion has a wider inner width than the narrower width portion.

As noted in the rejection, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a pair of side sealing portions having a plurality of projecting portions that bound a wider width portion and a narrower width portion, respectively, of the first and second flexible sheets. Further, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a packaging material packaging material for manufacturing a plurality of pouches that comprise a series of unit pouch areas that correspond to the plurality of pouches and are connected serially to each other along a length of the packaging material as required in claim 1. Thereby, Watanabe fails to recite every feature found in claim 1.

Tomiyoshi discloses a pair of projecting portions, a wider width portion, and a narrower width portion (Figs. 3 and 4). However, the wider width portion has the same inner width as the narrower width portion. Further, Tomiyoshi relates to the structure of a single pouch, not an elongated packaging material having a series of unit pouch areas corresponding to a plurality of pouches. Tomiyoshi does not remedy the deficiencies of Watanabe.

Gomi fails to teach or suggest a pair of side sealing portions having a plurality of projecting portions that bound a wider width portion and a narrower width portion, respectively, of the first and second flexible sheets as required in claim 1. Further, Gomi relates only to the structure of a single pouch, not to a plurality of pouches comprising a series of unit pouch areas connected serially to each other along a length of the packaging material as in claim 1. Therefore, the deficiencies of Watanabe and Tomiyoshi are not remedied by Gomi and the rejection should be withdrawn.


Claims 2 and 4 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1. The rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

S/N 10/573,318
In response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2009

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.


If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: April 7, 2010

By: 
Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/lif